

ANIMADVERSIONS

UPON

Dr. CALAMT's

DISCOURSE

IN THE

Conformists Cases

AGAINST

Dissenters,

CONCERNING

A Scrupulous Conscience.

Wherein the Nature of a *Doubling*, *Tender Con-*
science is Considered: Together with the
Duty of such as are *possessed* of

Rom. XIV. 23. *He that doubteth, is damned, if he*
eateth; because he eateth not of faith.

L O N D O N,

Printed: And are to be Sold by A. Baldwin, near the
Oxford-Arms Inn, in *Woolwich-Lane*. 1700.

of 70

Parkhurst

UPON

DISCOURSE

IN THE

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

A GAINST

Dissenters,

CONCERNING

the Separation of Conscience

AND THE RIGHTS OF THE MINISTRY

AND THE PEOPLE: Together with the
History of the Church of England

AND THE RIGHTS OF THE MINISTRY
AND THE PEOPLE: Together with the
History of the Church of England

AND THE RIGHTS OF THE MINISTRY

AND THE RIGHTS OF THE MINISTRY
AND THE PEOPLE: Together with the
History of the Church of England

ANIMADVERSIONS

UPON

Dr. CALAMY'S

DISCOURSE

IN THE

Conformists Cases

AGAINST

Dissenters,

CONCERNING

A Scrupulous Conscience.

IT would contribute (not a little) to the healing of our Breaches, if we could come to a due Notion:

1. Of a Doubting Tender Conscience.

2. Of the Duty of such as are possessed of it, with reference to their own Practice.

3. Concerning the Duty of Superiors, with relation to it in their Subjects or Inferiours Practice.

A 2

The

The *Author* of a lately-printed *Sermon*, called *A Discourse about a Scrupulous Conscience*, hath offered at two of these things :

He hath undertaken to tell us what is a *Scrupulous Conscience*, p. 4, 5. and again, p. 55. He hath given us its *Character* (as he judgeth) p. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. He hath directed us what to do to get quit of it, and how we ought to behave our selves under it, p. 18, 19, 20. and to the end of his Discourse. He hath not meddled with the Duty of *Superiors*, with relation to it, in the *Subjects* or *Inferiours Practice* : That (it may be) is fitter for *Chamber-Council*, than to be published upon the *House-tops*, however he hath fairly hinted it in his *Epistle-Dedicatory*.

The *Doubting Conscience* our *Author* calls every where a *Scrupulous Conscience*, and tells us p. 5 'It is con-

What is a
Scrupulous or
Doubting Con-
science.

versant about things in their own Nature indifferent, and consisteth in strictly tying up our selves to some things which God hath no where commanded; or in a conscientious abstaining from such things as are not forbid, nor any ways unlawful. P. 6. 'It starts, and boggles where there is no real Evil, or Mischief. He knows not better how to illustrate it, than by those inaccountable *Antipathies* that some Men have against some sorts of Meats or living Creatures, which have no harm in them, yet are so offensive and dreadful to such Persons, that they fly from them as they would from a Tiger or Bear: Just thus, (he saith) some run out of the Church at the sight of a Surplice, as if they had been scared by the Apparition of a Ghost. P. 35. he saith; When I speak of a *Scrupulous Conscience*, I suppose the Person tolerably well perswaded of the Lawfulness of a thing that is to be done; but yet he doth not like nor approve of it, he hath some little Reasons and Exceptions against it; it is not the best and fittest, all things considered. This is properly a *Scruple*, and is certainly the Case of all those who do sometimes (to save themselves from the Severity of the Laws) join in our Worship, and communicate with us, which we presume they would never do, did they judge it absolutely sinful and forbidden by God.

This is what the *Author* saith, to notify to us the thing whereof he speaks, and of which he afterwards affirms.

In the first place, it is worthy of our Enquiry from what *Diminution Office* this Term of *Scrupulous Conscience* (fronting the Book,

Book, and so often repeated in it,) is fetched. The Scripture speaking often of *Conscience*, (and that in the Author's Notion of it,) saith nothing of a *Scrupulous Conscience*; but hath brought all Complexions of *Conscience* under that of a *Perswaded Mind*, and a *Doubting Mind*, Rom. 14. 5. *Let every man be fully perswaded in his own mind: v. 23. And he that doubteth, is damned, if he eat; because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith, is sin.* There is not a Word of a *Scrupulous Conscience* in the whole Book of God.

By what Authority we first create a thing, and then destroy it, or of what Significancy to the World any such Employment is, I cannot tell. But I take the Term to be only a Term of *Defamation*, for a *Doubting Conscience* that is tender, and affraid to provoke a living God, knowing how fearful a thing it is to fall into his hands, Heb. 10. 31. If the Question were put, *What a Christian that doubteth of the Lawfulness of a thing in the Worship of God, may or ought to do; whether he may* (according to our Author's Position, p. 25.) *take the Lawfulness of the thing upon Trust from his legal Teachers, concluding himself no competent Judge of it himself: The Apostle would have resolved the Person before he e'er could have got to the Parsonage-house, Rom. 14. 23. He that doubteth, is damned, if he eat not; because he eateth not of faith.* We must not therefore state the Question about a *Doubting Mind*, but about a *Scrupulous Conscience*, that is a thing hardly to be found in Nature.

Our Author tells us it is conversant about things indifferent, things neither by God commanded nor forbidden; such things there are, even in the Worship of God, if we consider them abstractly from all Circumstances. But those very things may not be so, but either necessary or sinful, according to their different Positions, and diversified Circumstances. Now what things are indifferent, in actu exercito, or cloathed with all their Circumstances, for this or that Person to do or avoid, is no easie thing for a Christian to determine for himself, much less for another, who knoweth not his Circumstances, to determine for him. It is very possible, a thing may be lawful for another to do, yea it may be necessary, which it may be necessary for me to avoid, and both upon the same Account, viz. avoiding Sin against God; for, in this Case, what is one Man's Meat may be another Man's Poison: So that what is truly indifferent, as to particular

cular Practice, *pro hic & nunc*, we shall know at the Day of Judgment, but can no otherwise know it before, than from the Dictate of our own Consciences; which, if they be fully perswaded, Men may eat; but if they doubt, they are damned if they eat, (if St. Paul may be believed.) It was at that time of the Day a thing indifferent for Christians to eat, or not to eat the Meats prohibited to the Jews; to keep, or not to keep one of those Holy-days, which, before Christ's Coming, it was necessary for them to observe. All the Judaical Ceremonies were at that time indifferent; if they had not, Paul would neither have circumcised Timothy, Acts 16. 3. because of the Jews in those Quarters; nor purified himself and others at Jerusalem, Acts 21. 26. and yet declare to the Galatians, ch. 5. 2. that if they were circumcised, Christ should profit them nothing: Yet this great Apostle (the most undoubted Superior) doth not determine, that those that doubted might eat, nor determine them to eat, or keep the Days, tho' they doubted; but tells them plainly, *He that doubteth, is damned, if he eateth*, and only perswadeth those that did eat, not to despise those that did not, because God had received them, Rom. 14. 3. and because they, in not eating, were another's Servants; and, v. 17. the Kingdom of God lay not in these things; yet it so far lay in them, that if they doubted, they might not do them; and, v. 20. it was evil to eat with Offence, &c.

For our Author's Illustration, and comparing these Doubts to natural Antipathies, &c. in some Cases it is proper enough; but admit the Antipathy unaccountable, yet where it is, it is very hard to deliver our selves from it; and I doubt not but our Author hath so much of a Man in him, as if he knew a Person (as I have known some) that could not endure a Room where a Cat or a piece of Cheese were, without continual Sweating, Sickness, and fainting, he would pity the Person, and command the Cat or the Cheese to be taken out, and determine it mighty Cruelty for any to impose upon such a Person, that he should eat no Meat, if no Cheese might be upon the Table; nor sleep in quiet in any Room, where a Cat should not bear him Company. Such Imposers every one would determine no great Friends to Mankind, nor to have any Compassion for the Infirmities of Human Nature. *Facile*, saith he in *Tartarus*, *quum valens* *oculis confilium datus*: But David's Soul, *Psal.* 123. 4. *was*

was exceedingly filled with the scornings of those that were at ease, and with the Contempt of the Proud. Others might speak as they do, if their Souls were in their Souls stead; they might also heap up Words against them, and shake their Heads at them: But they hope that they should strengthen them with their mouth, and the moving of their lips should assuage their grief, Job 26. 4, 5. *Antipathies* are planted by the God of Nature; no mortal Hand can pluck them out. If these Doubts be as inaccountable things, yet certainly they ought no more to be called *Faction* and *Rebellion*, *Ungovernable Humours* and *Prejudices*; than the Child's forbearing to eat Cheese, notwithstanding its Mother's Perswasion, Arguments, Intreaties, ought to be stiled *Rebellion*, or *Disobedience to its Mother*.

But our Author is wonderfully confident to call *Christians Dissents*, as to the Lawfulness of some Ceremonies and Forms to be used in the Worship of God, *inaccountable Antipathies*; of which so great Men, as Mr. Cartwright, Dr. Ames, Mr. Bradshaw, Mr. Calderwood in his *Altare Damascenum*, Mr. Gillispy, (Men whose Learning cannot be question'd but by such as themselves are the Enemies of Learning,) have given so large Accounts, to say nothing of the whole Churches of Scotland, New-England, &c. and Hundreds of particular Persons, that use not to muffle their Readers with the blind Notions of *Sympathies* and *Antipathies*.

He tells us, p. 31. when he speaks of *Scrupulous Consciences*, he means such as are tolerably perswaded of the Lawfulness of the things, but yet do not like nor approve of it as the best, &c. He should have done well to have told us who these are; for we know none such. 'Yes, he saith, this is certainly the Case of 'all those who do sometimes, to save themselves from the Severity of the Laws, join in Worship and Communion with 'them, which, he presumes, they would never do, did they 'judge it absolutely sinful and forbidden by God.

Some such Persons indeed we know, and are heartily sorry that they meet with no better Encouragement than *Apostate Protestants* meet with from the *Papists*, who, when they have first debauch'd them, then make it their Business to expose them, and ridicule their Religion. But in this Case there is no *Apostacy*, and

and the *Ridicule* will return with Advantage upon the Expositors uncharitable Heads.

1. Those who do so, do in Heart believe, that the *Church of England* is no *Idolatrous Church*; that God hath not said unto it, *You are not my People*, and therefore they ought more totally to separate from it, than to have Communion with it, in any thing which they judge sinful; they therefore imitate our Saviour, who sometimes went to the Temple, and to the Synagogues, and to the Passover at *Easter* (tho' themselves have not the Liberty he had to preach in the Synagogues and the Temple, which makes them not so constant there as he,) but had no Communion with them in the *Traditional part of their Religion*, as our Author excellently observeth, p. 1, 2. Nor did he tie himself to their Exercise of Religion, but often preach'd elsewhere, and that not to Four only, but Four or Five thousand sometimes: So as they do it not merely to save themselves from the Severity of Laws, but are thus far a Law unto themselves.

2. But for ever to spoil our Adversaries of this pitiful Weapon, and little Advantage of reproaching their Brethren, we will for once suppose some Nonconformists went to hear the Prayers, and received the Sacrament in Parochial Churches, to save their Estates, to serve a Turn, to keep an Office, (as others express it) shall this conclude that they judge the things *universally lawful*, under all Circumstances? Things indeed, *morally wicked*, may never be done; things *morally necessary* may never be left undone: But certainly some *mala prohibita*, things which are only unlawful, because prohibited by a positive Law, and that do not respect *Acts of Worship*, or the Truth of it, but *Rites* relating to it, may under some Circumstances be done, which under others ought to be avoided; and may under some Circumstances be avoided, which under others may be lawfully done: Not that any thing prohibited by God, *pro hic & nunc*, may, *hic & nunc*, be done, that were to set up one higher than the highest; but because the same thing, that under these, or these Circumstances, is prohibited, under others is not. The Apostle determines to the *Corinthians*, that it was unlawful for them to eat Meat offered to Idols, if they had other Meat to eat, or if their Conscience doubted, or if their Brother was offended, 1 Cor. 10. 28. which
yet

yet was lawful, if bought in the Shambles, *1. 25.* or set upon their Neighbours Table, *2. 27.* Our Sayour hath satisfied us; *Matth. 12. 15.* That the Priests in the Temple *Prophane* the Sabbath, and are blameless; and hath taught the Physician and the Chirurgeon, that they may do the same in healing sick or lame Persons; and the Husbandman, that he may do the like, in giving Meat or Water to his Beasts, or lifting them out of the Pit. The People were blameless that were not for Forty Years together circumcised the Eighth Day, *Jos. 5. 5.* yet the Law was otherwise, *Gen. 17. 13, 14.* Christ sent the Scribes and Pharisees to learn the Meaning of that, *I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice*; and certainly the first Mercy is to be shewed to our selves. I do not therefore at all doubt, but if there can be found a Man who hath Knowledge enough to discern the Lord's Body, and Piety enough to lay hold upon Christ, and apply Him and his Benefits to his Soul, who yet forbear to receive the Sacrament at his Parish-Church: 1. Either because he did not like kneeling in the Act of Receiving; or because he should declare himself one Body with some Prophane Persons, or give Offence to other Conscientious Persons, &c. and in that was blameless, and did what he ought, being at liberty: But under such a Circumstance as this, he must do it, or starve himself and Family, or lie in a Goal all his Life; he may do it. Many things are lawful, which no good Christian ought to choose; and there are many things which under some Circumstances he may choose, which under others were Wickedness for him to choose. Nor will Superiors Commands justify the doing those Acts which other Circumstances will justify. Superiors Commands will justify none to work on his Trade on the Sabbath-Day; but the saving of a Man's Life, nay, the Life of a Beast, the quenching of a Fire in his own, or his Neighbour's House, will. But this is enough to stop the Mouth of this ignorant Clamour, and to let the World know that all are not *Knaves* whom some so call, and that some may be driven to a Sacrament, who saw no Reason to go without driving, and may, very probably, see as little

to *Animadversions upon Dr. Calamy's Discourse*

Reason to go, longer than till the Force (which was not good) doth abate, and be much less blameable than those that drive them, or such who in Obedience to that Force received the *Sacrament*, but not the *Eucharist*. This is enough to have animadverted upon what the *Author* hath upon the Notion of a *Doubting Conscience*, which he subtilly calls *Scrupulous*.

He comes in the next place to *defame* it : This he doth (having told us it is the same with that some call a *Tender Conscience*) by telling us,

1. ' That it is a very sickly, crazy Temper of Mind,
- p. 7.
2. ' That it is often a Sign of Hypocrisie, p. 8.
3. ' That nothing is more Troublesome and Vexatious, p. 11.
4. ' That these Scruples are endless, *ibid*.
5. ' That it hath done unspeakable Mischief to the Church of Christ, p. 13.

Our *Author* is the first Divine (at least that I ever met with) who first described what he meant by a *Scrupulous Conscience*, to take to be a *Tender Conscience*, and then told the World, 'It was a very sickly, crazy Temper of Mind, 'a great Indisposition, a State of Weakness and Infirmary, 'arising from Ignorance, and want of right understanding our Religion; from undue Timorousness, or Unsettledness of Mind; from Melancholy, or unreasonable Prejudices and Mistakes about the Nature of Things. What is? what can be a Tenderness of Conscience, but a *Fear of Offending the Great and Living God*? It is true, it is possible this may be too much, and often is, when advantaged from *Melancholy*, which naturally influenceth the Mind with *Fear*. It is as true, that *Fear* may sometimes arise from *Ignorance*, and that all *Fear*, respecting *Actions* to be done, doth so; (there will therefore be no such *Fear* in Heaven, where we shall no longer know in part, but as we are

Concerning a Scrupulous Conscience. 11

are known.) But *Knowledge in part* is our highest Attainment in this Life, which giveth a just Ground of Fear; and indeed, setting aside the Reverential Fear of God, (which is what will be found in Heaven) I do not know what that Fear of God is, by which all Religion is usually expressed in Scripture, but a Fear of offending God; and tho' it ariseth out of Ignorance, yet it is no sickly, crazy Temper, but as perfect a State of Heart as any Soul can have, not cured of the Mortality of the Body which it informeth. According to Degrees of Knowledge, so are Degrees of Fear, less or greater. Solomon saith, Prov. 28. 14. *Happy is he who feareth alway: but he that hardeneth his heart, shall fall into mischief.* Religion is oft described by Fearing God, but never by Confidence, or Boldness, or Hardness of Heart. Indeed, an Overfearfulness, or fearing where no Fear is, is a great Evil: But who shall judge of that? The Want of this *Externus Index* spoils all, and where to find him we cannot tell; for he is not to be found in Rome it self, as to things to be done. If a Man's own Conscience must be Judge, as to his Practice, an Overfearfulness is rather a Man's Misfortune than his wilful Sin. I should not have adventured to call it a crazy Temper, lest some should think that I should think that much Fear of God can make Men mad.

2. It is very true, that an over-much *Scrupulosity* may be sometimes a Sign of Hypocrisie; but never is so, unless in the Case he mentions of the Pharisees, when Men strain at Gnats, and swallow Camels: Let those who do so bear their Blame, and endure the Imputation of Hypocrites. But what does this concern others? *Making long Prayers* is also by our Saviour made a Mark of Hypocrisie; but it is only so when it is done in Pretence to cover the devouring Widows Houses. Our Author needed not to have told us, 'That they who pretend to such tender Consciences above other Men, must know, that the World will watch them as to the Fairness and Justice of their Dealings, the Calmness of their Tempers, their Behaviour in their several

12: *Animadversions upon Dr. Calamy's Discourse*

'relations, their Modesty, Humility, Charity, Peaceableness, and the like; because the Prophet *Jeremy* hath told us so, *Jer. 23. 10.* For I heard the defaming of many, fear on every side: Report, say they, and we will report: All my familiars watched for my halting: Peradventure he will be enticed, and we shall prevail against him, and take our revenge upon him. But besides, all this is built upon this Foundation, That every Man is an Hypocrite, who pretendeth Conscience in one thing, and sheweth it not in all things; because Conscience is uniform. Then he granteth, That every one that doth go to his Parish-Church, and there receiveth the Sacrament, according to all the Rites of the Church, yet is an Hypocrite, if he be a Common Drunkard, Sweater, Liar, Sabbath-breaker, Unjust in his Dealings, Uncharitable, an Unkind Husband or Wife, a Rebellious or Undutiful Child, Impudent, Proud, Turbulent, Quarrelsome, an Unfaithful Servant, &c. For the same Reason that concludeth the Non-conformists, so, for not going, yet being any of these ways guilty, will also conclude the Conformist so. If he be guilty, this will make Multitudes of Transgressors on Both sides, and not leave any great Crouds on either sides Masters of any Conscience: And after this, we need not propound the Question, *Are there few that shall be saved?* *Res ipsa loquitur.* It is true, that a True Good Conscience equally obligeth to every piece of the Divine Law, where the Mind is equally enlightned: But that every Man and Woman that is not an Hypocrite, will follow the Obligation to every part, with an equal Pace, I dare not say. It is as he apprehendeth the more or less hainous Nature of the Sin. It is commonly observed, that God is most Jealous in the Matters of his Worship; the Holy Scripture proveth it, the Wrath of God hath, from time to time, been most severely revealed against such Sins; and that not in the Case of Idolatry alone, (for that was neither the Case of *Nadab* and *Abihu*, nor yet of *Uzzab* or *Uzziab*, or *Saul*.) It is not therefore to be concluded, that that Man that is tender in these things, is an Hypocrite; tho' he may, as to some things, fail in his Dealings in Fairness, or Justice, (if

(if some may be Judges especially) or be guilty of what some Men call *Faction* and *Schism*, and *Disobedience to Superiors*. Even St. Paul himself, who durst deliver unto his *Corinthians* no more than what he had received from the Lord, was yet by *Tertullus*, *Acts* 24. 5. stiled a *Pestilent Fellow*, and a mover of *Sedition* amongst all the Jews throughout the World, and a *Ring-leader* of the *Sett* of the *Nazarenes*; which was as much as a *Factionous Person*, and a *Schismatick*, and *Disobedient to Superiors*. By the same Reason, that a Man may more fear *Murther* and *Treason*, than a little *unconscionable Gain*, or *Petty-Laceny*, even a *Conscientious* Man may fear *Deviations* from the *Rule of Worship*, more than some other Errors of his Life, either not known to him, or not of the highest *Magnitude*. But, I trust, the World shall see, and in part doth see, the *Generality* of *Nonconformists* as much affraid of a *Lewd* and *Prophane* Life, as they are of doing what is *superfluous*, or (as they apprehend) *forbidden in the Worship of God*. If there be a *Judas* amongst the Twelve, he will not determine all the rest *Traitors*, I hope; for they generally let the World judge on which side are the most (Number for Number) Men of *Righteousness*, in giving to every one their due Right; or *Charity*, in giving *Alms* of such Things as they have; or *Modesty*, in their Speeches or Behaviours.

3. It is very true, that there is nothing more troublesome than *unreasonable Scruples*: But what is this to those that have a *moral Certainty* of the *unlawfulness* of things? which is as much as Men can have as to the most of things to be done or avoided: There are very few *Dissenters* but do at least pretend to this, as to those things they boggle at, believing things may by Circumstances be made *unlawful*, which, possibly, under other Circumstances would not be so, as well as other things which are against the *Light of Nature*, or the express Letter of the *Divine Law*.

4. For the *Infiniteness of Scruples*, it is but asserted; nor will it follow, that because some particular Persons may scruple or doubt any thing, therefore it is the best way to fear, or doubt of nothing.

5. Nor doth it follow, that because the *needless scrupling lawful things hath done Mischief to the Church*, therefore none may doubt the Lawfulness of the things which others say are *lawful*, and while they doubt, forbear the doing of them; especially considering, that if the things be but *lawful*, they are not *necessary* to be imposed upon any. This our *Author* is aware of, p. 26. and tells us, 'He only considereth things as they stand, and will not consider the Duty of Superiors, how far they may, or ought to condescend to the Weakness of others. He tells us also further, 'That if this were a sufficient Reason why the Constitution of any Church should be altered, because some things are scrupled in it, there would never be any settled Church while the World stands.——

There is nothing now doubted by any sober Person, but what was doubted, and the Reasons of those Doubts propounded before any such *Constitution* was, (if he means that we were constituted by the last Act of *Uniformity*.) If the Reasons did not seem sufficient to the *Authors* of that *Constitution*, we cannot help it; they then did, and yet do appear so unto many, and that not only of the present, but the former Ages, and that not in *our own Church* only, but are done in no other *Reformed Churches*, (except the *Lutheran Churches*) from whom our Church also in other things enough differeth. Still we want a *Judex externus de agendis*, one that shall infallibly judge for others concerning *Sin* and *Duty*: For if a Man's Conscience only can execute that Office, the *Superior* indeed (being Judge of his own Act) may inforce, imprison, ruine Men and Families, for not obeying what he granteth he is under no Necessity to command. The *Inferior*, that judgeth the thing *sinful*, must lie in Prison, satisfying himself with the

Liberty

Liberty of his Spirit, and take the spoiling of his Goods joyfully, believing that he hath in Heaven a better and far more enduring Substance, or suffer Exile, *looking for a better Country*; and it must be determined at the last Day who is in the Right: And when all is said that can be, this is all that the Word of God will allow any *Inferior* in the Case, save that it will oblige him to use the best Means he can further to inform himself; in order to which, our Author is so Charitable as to lend us his *Candle*: Let us see if, by all the Endeavours we can use, we can light ours by it.

1. His First Direction is excellent, *viz. To beget and cherish in our Minds the Most High, and Worthy, and Honourable Thoughts of God Almighty*: But his Enlargements on this Head we cannot so well agree. Had it not been *Sophistry* for any Person to have argued thus: 'Can the Man have becoming and excellent Thoughts of the Divine Nature, who imagineth that he regards whether the Ark be carried on a Cart, or upon Mens Shoulders; whether the Fire drops from Heaven, or be taken out of the Kitchen, by which Incense is burned to him? If any say we are not under the same Dispensation, was there then in these things any thing either Typical or Carnal? Hath not God as sufficiently revealed his Will for Gospel, as for Legal Worship? He certainly hath the most honourable Thoughts of God, who thinks him the fittest to direct his own Homage, and not one whose Wisdom ought to be controlled, or may be so much as tacitly impeached. The Phrases of thinking to *Flatter* or *Honour* God, might have been spared by one advising others to *High, Worthy, and Honourable Thoughts of God*. Offer them now to a Prince, will they be accepted?

2. Whereas the Author adviseth us to lay out our great Care about necessary and substantial Duties, he speaketh well; the Apostle indeed doth tell us, *Rom. 14. 17. The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace,*

16 *Animadversions upon Dr. Calamy's Discourse*

peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost; in the same Sense that the Prophet tells us, *God will have mercy, and, not sacrifice*: But if this be urged to perswade us to do things, the Lawfulness of which we doubt, whoso urgeth it, is confuted by the last Words of the same Chapter; *He that doubteth, is damned, if he eateth; because he eateth not of faith: whatsoever is not of faith, is sin*. It is indeed a Text well urged, to let those that eat know it is their Duty, not to despise, not to judge, much less to ruine and undoe those that doubtingly dare not eat, and can meet with no Satisfaction to their Doubts, tho' they diligently seek and desire it.

3. We needed not therefore our *Author's* Advice, to be willing to receive Satisfaction, if the Desires of Peace and Unity, the Goodness of our Natures, our Love to our Wives and Children, would not obtain this of us: Yet surely the destroying of our Healths by nasty Prisons, the taking away our Estates, would, e're this time, have made us willing, if it had been possible for us, to have believed what we listed, or the Dread of God had not awed us from doing, what we believe is not lawful for us to do. We have read the Books wrote on these Arguments, but it is our Unhappiness that we cannot find the Question truly stated. If we tell them a thousand times, that we question not the Lawfulness of some *Circumstances* to be appointed in Worship, but of appointing *Ceremonies* and *Rites* entailed to Acts of Worship; still we find the Question stated about *Circumstances*, *Whether Superiors may appoint them*? Let us often tell them, the Question is not, *Whether we may do things which we scruple*? but, *Whether we may do things which we by Arguments, which we cannot answer, do judge unlawful*? yet the next time the Question is stated, shall be about *Scruples*? Tell them, the Question is not about things *indifferent*, but things which (whatever Opinion Superiors have of them) we judge *sinful*; still (*will we, nill we,*) it must be taken for granted, that the things are *indifferent*. If we tell them, the Question is not about
the

the Lawfulness of Forms of Prayer, nor yet of the Lawfulness of their Use in Devotion, as well as for Instruction; but of the Lawfulness of the universal Use of them by all Persons, and those Forms too not prescribed by God, nor made by him that himself afterwards useth them, but such as are made for our Use by other Men, and imposed on us; the next time the Question is stated, it shall be about the Lawfulness of Forms of Prayer, a thing we never denied. We would be very glad if our Reverend Author could direct us to any one Book, where the Questions we insist upon are truly stated, and the Part opposite to us closely argued, and we not only pressed with the Arguments of meer Authority commanding, and the Practice of Antiquity, when 'tis certain Superiors are not to be obey'd in all things, and we cannot find any such Antiquity; nor, if we could, can judge it a sufficient Guide to our Consciences.

We do not despise, nor neglect (some of us at least) to go to our Ministers, nay, to some Parochial Ministers, (tho' we could never understand Parishes, *Jure Divino*; nor the Rectors, or Vicars, or Curates, of or in them, as such, to be so; tho' we own a Ministry, and their Ministry (many of them we mean) to be such,) but all that we can hear from them, is, *The things commanded, are indifferent; being commanded, you are bound to obey your Superiors: If not, we must present you, &c.* When we tell them, That if we could judge them indifferent, our Obedience would be Matter of Dispute to none or few of us; but we cannot so judge them. They indeed tell us, *God hath no where forbidden them*; but when we reply, Neither hath God in any Letter of Scripture forbidden us the Use of Salt, and Cream, and Spittle, or Oil, in Baptism; yet, were these things commanded, we could not judge them lawful, because of no Institution, no Necessity, no Use; we cannot hear any thing satisfactorily replied. We own our selves bound to obey Superiors in things lawful, but we cannot allow our Superiors, as to our Practice, to be Judges

18. *Animadversions upon Dr. Calamy's Discourse*

of things always lawful in God's Worship, because they cannot foresee all *Circumstances* that may make things in themselves lawful, *pro hic & nunc*, unlawful. We cannot allow our selves the same Liberty to practise, as our *Physician* directs us, for the *Health* of our *Bodies*, or a *Lawyer*, for the *Security* of our *Estates*, and, as our *Minister* directs, for our *Souls*, because we think our *Souls* better, than our *Bodies* and *Estates*; and therefore a Trust as to them cannot be so safe, but of infinite more Hazard; and besides, tho' we have not *Avicen*, and *Paracelsus*, and *Galen*, and *Hippocrates*, to read, and if we had them, we could not understand them, and the *Physician* prescribes not *ad hominem*, but *ad Soeratem*; yet we have the Word of God, it is nigh us, in our Eyes and Ears, we can read it, and it prescribes *ad homines*, the same things to all Men, and we are bid to *search it*, and by it to *prove all things*, and then to *hold fast what is good*, (not in others, but in our own Eyes :) So as, under Correction, the Reason is not the same for following the Prescripts of *Divines*, as of *Physicians* and *Lawyers*; yet few Men will follow either of them, if they have any strong Opinion they advise them ill, tho' they may, when they have nothing to object to what they prescribe or advise.

But the *Author* is aware, that the *Trumpets* also may give uncertain Sounds, the very *Guides* and *Ministers* of Religion may determine differently. He directs also what to do in this Case, p. 25, 26.

1. His first Direction is very Reasonable, 'That those who are able tolerably to judge for themselves, should not rely upon the Authority of any that do it, nor become the *Profelytes* of any, further than they give them good Scripture and Reason for it: Let that Soul forfeit the Name of Rational and Religious too, that will not receive this. This is indeed to make Men *Profelytes* of the Law. But,

2. 'For others, he saith, (and how to know them he hath not told us,) they had better trust to, and depend on those Ministers of known Sufficiency for their Office, who are regularly, and by the Laws of the Land set over them, than any other Guides and Teachers that they can choose for themselves. This he saith, *To be sure is the safest Course.* But he afterwards tells us, 'He speaks not of such things as concern the Salvation of Men, which are plain and evident to the meanest Capacities, but of Forms and Ceremonies. His Reason is, 'Because, if they chance to mislead the People, they have something to say for themselves: Their Error is more excusable and pardonable, as being occasioned by those to whose Judgment, by God's Command, the People owe a great Respect and Submission.

I know not how we shall ever agree here, unless in this :

1. That they had better trust to, and depend upon none at all, but the Judgment of *their own Consciences*, enlightned first, as well as may be, by the Information of those Learned and Holy Men on both sides, who may in the Point differ one from another, after seeking God for his Direction.

2. For the Truth is, we are for no Trusts, in Matters of *Sin or Duty*, (all which Things we take to be Matters of *Salvation or Damnation*.) in which Case, none ought to trust any further than they can see, tho' they ought to use the best Means for seeing, they can. The taking *Credenda*, or the Matters of Faith, upon Trust, is the *Foundation-Error of Popery*: He taking *Agenda*, Matters of Practice, wherein the Safety or Eternal Hazard of a Soul is concerned, is something as bad as *Popery*.

3. It will puzzle an *Angel* to make us understand what *Virtue* or *Ability* there is or can be in a Teacher, whom the Laws of the Land have set over us, above what is in one whom God hath set over us: There is indeed no Opposition betwixt these two; God may have set one to watch for our Souls, whom the Laws of a Land may authorize to it, but one may by the Laws of a Land be set over us, whom God never so set. He that should say, that in *Papish Countries* God hath set those *Priests* and *Confessors* over People, whom the Laws of those Countries have so set, will find it an hard Task to prove what he saith.

4. Nor can we understand how the *Laws of a Land* can set *Pastors over Souls*: They can make *Rectors*, and *Parsons*, and *Vicars*, give them *Glebes*, and *Tithes*, and *Houses*; (but *All Souls are mine*, saith God.) We would gladly see it proved, that in the Spiritual Concerns of our Souls any can be set over us, but those whom God hath so set, that is, who come to their Places in that *Method* and *Order* which God hath prescribed. Now that God hath any where directed how *Human Laws* should set *Pastors* over People, wants better Proof than any we have seen: We only reject the Notion till we see it prov'd by any Line of Scripture, or any thing which looketh like *Venerable Antiquity*.

5. We can as little understand how any erring, through the Mistakes of any such Guides, should have this to say for themselves, *Our Error is occasioned by those, to whose Judgments, by thy Command, (O God!) we owed a great Submission?* Where hath God required such a Submission, a Respect and Reverence indeed is due; but that a *Submission of Conscience* also is, we no where find.

4. Our Author's next Direction, is, *thoroughly to consider the Nature of Lawful, and how it differeth from what is necessary, and what is sinful.* Who doth not know, that a thing
lawful

Concerning a Scrupulous Conscience. 21

lawful is what is neither commanded nor forbidden? That is, not forbidden, either in the Letter of Scripture, or the true Sense of it; either generally, or particularly, or consequentially; either in it self, considered seperately from Circumstances, or as attended with such or such Circumstances. This way of arguing indeed is very plain and convincing; but if the Meaning be not forbidden abstractly, or in the *Enm*, or Letter of Scripture, it is very false, and weak, and fallacious.

Our Author, p. 28. takes notice of two Mistakes (as he thinks) upon which Mens Scruples are founded, as to Rites and Ceremonies.

1. That nothing in the Worship of God is lawful, but what himself hath appointed. I know none that thinks so; there are indeed some that think, that nothing in the Worship of God is lawful, which himself hath not appointed, which is idle, and superfluous, and not necessary to the Performance of it, upon the Account of Nature, Convenience, or apparent Decency.

2. Neither doth any say, that those things are unlawful to be used in God's Worship, which are necessary upon any of the afore said Accounts, and are but Appendants of Divine Worship, not entering into the Bowels of it, tho' they have been abused in Idolatrous Worship; for other things, there are many who think them *eo nomine*, unlawful, and may think so still, for any thing our Author hath said to the contrary.

5. Our Author would have Men to consider, That there never was, nor will be, any Constitution that will be every way unexceptionable. If he had said, against which none will make Exception, we should have found no Difficulty to have agreed it; but surely there may be a Constitution that is not exceptionable: For if only things confessedly necessary be enjoined, and things which may be left at Liberty, be so left, and
a little

a little *Charity* used, such a *Constitution* must be unexceptionable.

6. Indeed his last Direction must make an end of all Controversie of this Nature, if it were practicable, *viz.* to throw our Doubts out of our Minds as dangerous Temptations. This is as if one should advise one under a great Fit of the Stone, or Gout, &c. never to think of his Pain. Our Author fancieth rightly, that some would be under Temptations, to think, that he hath been perswading Men to conform to the Orders of the Church, tho' they be not satisfied in their Minds concerning them. He tells us in plain Terms, He thinks this the best Advice can be given such scrupulous Persons. It hath only two Faults, 1. That it is very hard, if not impossible, to be taken. It is every whit as easie to shake off a Fit of the Gout or Stone, as to shake off a Doubt; both may be done in Time, and by the Application of proper Means: But I know of none would keep Doubts, if they knew how to be rid of them. 2. That it is contrary to the Apostle's Opinion, *Rom. 14. 23. And he that doubteth is damned, if he eat; because he eateth not of Faith.* The Apostle is there plainly speaking of things at that time indifferent; and in all that Chapter he saith not a Word of Christians conforming to Practices, tho' they be not satisfied of their Lawfulness in their Minds. Could we but clear our Eyes of Interest and Passion, (of not immoderate Wrath too against our Brethren,) we might see better Advice by half given, *v. 3. Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth; for God hath received him: and, v. 13. Let us not judge therefore one another; but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling-block, or an occasion to fall, in his brother's way. v. 14. To him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, it is unclean. v. 15. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died.* If our Author should tell us again, he takes things as they are, he doth not command these things, &c. In case they ought not to have been enforced, or at least not at the rate they are, he ought also to let them alone as they are.

Our

Our Saviour reflects on the Pharisees and Scribes, as *Matth. 23.* for that they builded the tombs of the prophets, and garnished the sepulchres of the righteous; and yet said, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been Partakers with them in the blood of the prophets.

He saith, *p. 24.* He doth not encourage Men to venture blindfold upon Sin. Is it not Sin then for Men to eat doubting? Is not all Sin that is not of Faith? *Rom. 14. 23.* the Apostle there saith, Let every man be fully perswaded in his own mind of the Lawfulness of a thing, (for he cannot otherwise be interpreted. Our Author tells us, That before we refuse to comply with the Orders of a Church (which possibly ought not to have been made, at least we judge so) we ought to be fully perswaded of the Unlawfulness of what is required. Now is not this to act Blindfold? The Apostle indeed was of another Mind, he would have our Eyes direct our way; but our Author tells us, that if we do not see a plain, deep Pit, we ought to follow our Mother.

Our Author is aware, *p. 35.* that some would say, This Principle, once imbib'd, will bring in Popery. All the Answer he gives us, is, That there are many things in Popery manifestly evil, and forbidden by the Revealed Will of God, &c.

1. Then it is granted, that it necessarily brings in all that is in Popery, that is not manifestly evil; and that, according to our Author's Phrase, *p. 34.* we are not fully perswaded is evil. Welcome then Oil, Spittle, and Cream in Baptism, with an Hundred more such Popperies: Welcome Elevations of the Bread, and the Priests many crossing themselves and it, &c. Nay, welcome Veneration (tho' not Adoration) of Images, &c.

2. To whom must the things be manifestly evil? If to Superiors only, few things in Popery are so to their Superiors; if to Inferiors, who shall judge whether they be so, or no? Shall the Inferior? Then our Author hath said nothing,

24 *Animadversions upon Dr. Calamy's Discourse*

thing, unless to those (which are very few) who think, that in the Worship of God, things (confessedly) indifferent) if imposed, become manifestly evil.

Our Author, p. 35. begins to think of *Rom. 14. 19, 23.* To him that esteemeth any thing unclean, it is unclean; and, v. 23. He that doubteth is damned, if he eateth; because he eateth not of faith: whatsoever is not of faith, is sin. To these he answers,

1. That he means by a *Scrupulous Conscience*, the Conscience of a Person tolerably persuaded of the Lawfulness of what is to be done; but yet he doth not like it, nor approve of it; he hath some little Reasons and Exceptions against it; it is not the best and fittest, all things considered. He should have done well, first to have found out one that owned such a Conscience, otherwise he meaneth none of those he hath all this while been arguing against. Surely Men must have mighty Opinions of themselves, beyond their just Stature, that can have such an Opinion as this of all which hath been said in the Cases in question by *Dr. Ames, Bradshaw, Calderwood, Gillespy, Cotton*, and an Hundred more. But to what our Author hath here said, I have before spake fully.

2. He answers, Secondly, 'That if the Question be about things, wherein we are left wholly to our selves, and are at Liberty, having no other weighty Reason for the doing of them, then it may be the safest way to forbear all such things as we scruple at. But in these two Cases, it is most for the Quiet of our Consciences to act against, or, notwithstanding our Fears and Scruples, when either our Superiors (to whom we owe Obedience) have interposed their Commands, or when by it we prevent some great Evil, or Mischief. These Superiors he makes to be *Civil or Ecclesiastical*, who may be so called, yet so long as they are in the exercise of their office, and in the discharge of their duty. This

1. This now is no more than what indeed Bishop *Sander-son* long since said, and we shall most of us agree with him, and with this Author, in things of meer *Conveniency* and *Expediency*, where we cannot sin in doing the one part, or the other; tho' as to *Expediency*, *Quicquid non expedit, in quantum non expedit non licet*, is a known Rule amongst Divines. Things meerly inexpedient, so far forth as they are inexpedient, are not lawful, 1 Cor. 10. 23. But here, how to distinguish betwixt things of meer *Conveniency* and *Expediency*, we cannot tell, unless by Expedient be meant apparently decent, whose contrary would be indecent. If by things expedient be meant τὰ σπουδαῖα, or τὰ εὐκόμιστα, as the Apostle doth, 1 Cor. 10. it can by no means be agreed. I think it therefore better expressed by *Things in doing or forbearing which we shall not sin against God*. In such things, the most of us shall freely yield what our Author saith.

2. But if he extends his Notion further than these things, we cannot yield what our Author saith; for then the Apostle's Sense must be, *He that doubteth is damned, if he eateth*, except his Civil or Ecclesiastical Superiors command him to eat; nor will it agree with the next Words, *because he eateth not of faith*, that is, of a full Perswasion of the Lawfulness of what he doth, unless any one will say, that is sufficient to perswade us fully the thing is lawful, if it be commanded by our Superiors, which most certainly it is not. This is such an Interpretation of what the Apostle saith, as will serve to make all things lawful which the Light of Nature doth not shew us an eternal Turpitude and Filthiness in. We must loose our Bibles before we can agree this.

His Second Case, wherein he thinks Men may lawfully depart from their Liberty, is to avoid a greater Evil. This Evil he makes to be *Division from the Church*. Still the Question is, *Whether Men may depart from their Consciences*

for *Unity*? Or, Whether Men may do what they verily judge sinful for them to do, provided it be not against the plain Letter of Scripture, but only by them so concluded from easie Consequences of Scripture, to keep *Unity* with those that do those things, probably not so judging.

The *Unity* also talk'd of, is neither *Unity of Affection*, nor in *Matters Doctrinal*, nor in *Acts of Worship*, by God prescribed, nor in *Modes or Circumstances of Worship* so prescribed. The Dissent is in none of these things, but in things (confessedly) unnecessary to be required, as to the End, Conveniency, or apparent Decency of the Action. But in things of *meer Human Appointment*, falling under none of these Qualifications, we beg our *Author's* Pardon for thinking that *Unity* in these things is not to be preferred before the Satisfaction of our private Consciences, that the things are lawful before we do them. I dare assure our *Author*, that very many *Dissenters* will be very well pleased with him for propounding to them, p. 39. our blessed Saviour's Example. His Case was this:

He was born and bred a Member of the *Jewish Church*, constituted by God himself, in which Church there were very great Corruptions in the Time when he lived; but the *Law was read*; and the *Passover* was administred in it, which every *Jew*, not being unclean, was bound to eat; the *Law* was also expounded and preached there. He freely reprov'd, and bare a Testimony against their *Traditions*, and what they had added to the Worship of God: He would not religiously wash his Hands before Meat, as our *Author* confesseth, p. 1, 2. But having a publick Liberty himself to teach and preach in the *Temple* and in the *Synagogues*, (tho' he had no share in the Revenue of the Priests and Levites,) he used it, and often heard the *Law* of his Father opened and read, often reading and opening it himself; in the mean time he would himself have nothing to do with their *Traditions*, (not so much as to *wash his Hands* religiously,) but only with his Father's Institutions;

Concerning a Scrupulous Conscience. 27

tions; nor did he think himself obliged only to preach there, but in many other Places, in *Ships*, upon *Mountains*, in *Private Houses*, in *Fields*, and that not to Four or Five only, but to Four and Five thousand. Dissenters only crave that they may go and do likewise: If they may not, this Example is ill produced.

For the Churches of *Corinth*, &c. they do not think themselves further bound to follow them than as they followed Christ, (who did not admit *drunken* Persons to the Sacrament,) and had our Author pleased, he could have put a fairer Sense upon *wine* than *drunken*; and so our Translators have done, *John* 2. 10. where the Translation is, *When men have well drunk*, (yet the same Word in the Greek is there used,) and that is all meant, *1 Cor.* 11. 21. For as none will say that, *Job* 2. 10. it signifies *men stark drunk*; so, in *1 Cor.* 11. 21. the Disorder he reproveth amongst the *Corinthians*, is thus expressed, *For in eating, every one taketh before his own Supper, and one is hungry, and another, wine, hath drunk sufficiently*; so as it should seem that they made the Lord's Supper but as a *Banquet*; or *Grace-cup*, after their own Supper; so could not receive it with that *Premeditation*, and *Preparation*, and *Holy Reverence*, which they ought.

Our Author concludes with magnifying of *Unity*, and perswading to it, minding us of the high Sense the *Primitive Christians* and old *Nonconformists* had of *Division*; and at last tells us, *In all that I have now said, I am not conscious to my self, that I have used any Argument but what many of those very Ministers, who now dissent from us, did teach and maintain, and print too, against the Independants, and other Sectaries that divided from them, when they preached in the Parish-Churches. And if this was good Doctrine for those who seperated upon the account of Corruptions, for purer Ordinances, in those Days, I see not why it is not as good against themselves, when upon the very same Pretences, and no other, they divide from us now.*

We would willingly know what *Unity* it is they plead for. Is it an Union of *Love and Affection*? We profess our selves seperated from no part of Mankind in that Sense, and more particularly to love our own Nation, all those in it, more especially who are *Protestants*, and to have a more particular Delight and Complacency in such of them as we see live Holy Lives, in a more strict Conformity to their Rule.

Is it an Union in *Doctrines*? We have often enough professed our selves in Heart to believe all Doctrines of Faith contained in the Holy Scripture, particularly those in the Articles of the Church of *England*, so far as concerneth Doctrine. In the *Irish* Articles, and *Scottish* Articles, what in this thing can they ask more?

Is it an Union in the same *specificall Acts of Worship*? We use no other than is and always was used in the Church of *England*; *Prayer, Preaching, Hearing the Word, Baptizing Infants, Receiving the Lord's Supper, &c.*

Is it in the Circumstances of Worship *necessary*, as some *Time and Place* is, some *Gesture and Habit* is? Was there ever such an Unity, or Uniformity in *England*? Or is there now? Did all People ever meet in the same Place, or at the same Time, or in the same Habits, or use the same Gestures? At all times, did not some pray standing, some kneeling, some sitting? And did they not always as much differ as to their Gesture at the Sacrament? Or *Convenient*, or *obviously decent Circumstances*? Are then all the Parish-Churches equally convenient, or their Pulpits, or Seats, for Preaching or Hearing? Do all Persons come to Churches in Habits equally decent? Tho', possibly, few use Habits indecent, which none can charge on us.

Do not all use the same Words in Prayer? And do Conformists all use the same, or did they ever use the same in the Pulpit and the Desk?

Go

Do we not all meet with them in the same Place? Can then all the People in a great Town or City so meet? Is the *Division* here then, that we do not agree *Parochial Societies*, to be *particular Churches*? Which amongst our Conformable Brethren will so own them? Surely they reckon the *Diocess* the *Particular Church*, and the *Bishop* the *Pastor*. Will not we own *Bishops*, and the *Government of the Church* by them? We cannot indeed own them by *Divine Right* to have any such Power; but we will own the *King* to be the *Governour of the Church*, under Christ, not to make new Laws, but to put his Laws in execution, and to have Power to appoint his *Commissioners*, under what *Titles* he pleaseth, (whether *Archbishops* or *Bishops*;) who shall have Power (by *Virtue of such Commission*) to do in the Church whatsoever the *King* may do; and if these *Commissioners* be also Ministers of the Gospel, by *Virtue of that Commission* from Christ, they shall also do what any Gospel-Ministers may do.

All the Cry against Dissenters, for *dividing* and rending the Peace of the Church, amounts to this:

1. That they can own no intrinsic Officers in the Church, whom Christ hath not appointed in his Word.
2. That they can own no Laws in Worship, but what he hath made by himself, or his Commissioners the Apostles, till those be proved not to have been sufficient.
3. That they cannot allow the *Bounds of Parishes* to be on that account the *Bounds of Churches*, nor Inhabitants in them sufficient to entitle all baptized Persons to be Members of the Church in that Place.
4. That they cannot agree all Persons of Sixteen Years of Age, to be fit to receive the Lord's Supper, (a thing never allowed by any Church in the World.) To make the Matter short, *Dissenters* profess themselves ready to unite with their Brethren in all things relating to Worship, for which the least Line of Scripture shall be shewn, and in other things, if they can be made appear naturally necessary for the Actions, or convenient, or decent. We never need

30 *Animadversions upon Dr. Calamy's Discourse, &c.*
need fear breaking with them, who will not upon these Terms unite with us.

The Case of the Difference betwixt *Presbyterians* and *Others*, was this: The *Presbyterians* were regulating things according to the *Divine Will*; offered their Brethren Liberty to preach, yea, and in the greatest Congregations; were ready to hear them in any thing they could object in their Practice, contrary to the Word of God, and to reform any thing; professed to make nothing their Rule, but the Word of God: They had Reason to blame those who on these Terms would not unite with them. Are these the Terms of Union now offered?

It may be some particular Persons were too hot at first, and said what themselves afterwards saw Cause to alter their Minds in, (and that in the Space of two or three Years.) Men, when they are just awake, see not so distinctly as they afterwards do. Our first Reformers altered many things in *Doctrine*, of which they had a tolerable Opinion when they came first out of *Papery*. Because *Cranmer* himself, and some others, thought some things at first good Doctrine, which themselves had afterward other Thoughts of, doth it follow it is good Doctrine still? In things of this nature, we are to take our Measures from no mutable Men, but from the immutable Rule. Authority therefore is impertinently urged, and is an Argument only *ad excitandum odium*, to stir up some ignorant Peoples Passions.

To let every one see the Weakness of this Argument, let us turn it into Form.

Prop. What was good Doctrine Forty Years ago, in the Mouths of *Presbyterians*, against *Independents* and *Others*, is good Doctrine still. But what is in this Sermon about *Scrupulous Consciences*, and the Duty of *Christians* that have them, was good Doctrine Forty Years since in the Mouths of the *Presbyterians* against the *Independents*: Therefore it is good Doctrine still.

We deny the *Minor*, or Second Proposition, and so take our Leave of the Doctor, supposing it will take Forty Years more to make it good.

F I N I S.

*Books Printed for, and Sold by Tho. Parkhurst,
at the Bible and Three Crowns in Cheapside,
near Mercers-Chapel.*

EXpository Notes on the Four Evangelists; wherein the Sacred Text is at large recited, and the Sense explained; together with the Instructive Pexample of the Holy Jesus is recommended to our Imitation. By *William Burkitt*, M. A. and Vicar of *Dedham in Essex*.

Divine Comforts Antidoting inward Perplexities of Mind; being a Discourse upon *Psalms 94. ver. 19*. By *T. Sharp*, M. A.

Wilful Impenitency the grossest Self-Murder; in several Sermons Preached at *Rochford in Essex*. By *William Fenner*, B. D.

Plain Method of Catechising; shewing, That Ministers, Parents, and Masters, ought to be faithful Teachers of the first Principles of the Christian Doctrine. By *T. Doolittle*, M. A. in Compassion to the Ignorant.

The Young Man's Guide in his Way to Heaven; or, Traveling spiritualized.

The General Assembly; or, the gathering of the Saints together. By *Oliver Heywood*, M. A.

The Order of the Gospel professed and practised by the Churches in *New-England*; in Answer to several Questions relating to Church-Discipline. By *Increase Matther*, President of *Harvard Colledge in Cambridge, New-England*.

Primitia Synagoga; or, a Sermon Preached at the opening of a New Erected Meeting-house in *Ipswich*. By *John Fairfax*, M. A.

The Fountain of Life opened and explained; or, a Display of Christ; in his Essential and Mediatorial Glory; containing Forty Two Sermons on various Texts. By *John Flavel*, M. A.

Of Thoughtfulness for the Morrow, with an Appendix concerning the immediate desire of foreknowing Things to come.

The Redeemer's Tears wept over lost Souls, in a Treatise on *Luke 19. 41, 42.* with an Appendix, wherein somewhat is occasionally

fully Discoursed concerning the Sin against the Holy Ghost, and how God is said to will the Salvation of them that perish.

A Calm and Sober Enquiry concerning the possibility of a Trinity in the God-head, in a Letter to a Person of Worth; occasioned by the lately Published Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity. By Dr. Wallis, Dr. Sherlock, Dr. South, Dr. Cudworth, &c. Together with certain Letters (hitherto unpublished) formerly written to the Reverend Dr. Wallis on the same Subject.

A Letter to a Friend concerning a Postscript to the Defence of Dr. Sherlock's Notion of the Trinity in Unity, relating to the Calm Enquiry on the same Subject.

A View of that part of the late Considerations address'd to H. H. about the Trinity; which contains the Sober Enquiry on that Subject.

A Treatise of the Soul of Man, wherein the Divine Original, Excellent and Immortal Nature of the Soul, are opened; its Love and Inclination to the Body, and the Necessity of its Separation from it, considered and improved. The Existence, Operations, and States of separated Souls both in Heaven and Hell immediately after Death, asserted, discussed, and variously applied. Divers knotty and difficult Questions about departed Souls, both Philosophical and Theological, stated and determined.

The Method of Grace in bringing home the Eternal Redemption, contrived by the Father and accomplished by the Son, thro' the Effectual Application of the Spirit unto God's Elect, being the Second Part of Gospel Redemption.

The Divine Conduct or Mystery of Providence, its Being and Efficacy asserted and vindicated. All the Methods of Providence in our Course of Life opened, with Directions how to apply and improve them.

Navigation Spiritualiz'd, or a new Compass for Seamen, consisting of Thirty Two Points of pleasant Observations, profitable Applications, serious Reflections, all concluded with so many spiritual Points, &c.

Two Sermons on various Texts, by John Wesley, M. A. concerning the immediate duty of converting to God, &c. The Redeemer's Tears, wept over lost souls, in a Treatise on the Redemption of the Soul, with an Appendix wherein is described the manner of recovering the soul, &c.